



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,179	03/05/2002	Handong Wu	NETAP020	7494
28875	7590	03/01/2006	EXAMINER	
Zilka-Kotab, PC P.O. BOX 721120 SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120			DADA, BEEMNET W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/092,179	WU ET AL.	
	Examiner Beemnet W. Dada	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in reply to an amendment filed on December 12, 2005. Claims 1, 20, 22 and 30 have been amended and new claims 31-35 have been added. Claims 1-35 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1, 3-11, 13-19, 30 and 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaidya US Patent 6,279,113 B1 in view of Li et al. US Patent 6,567,408 B1 (hereinafter Li).

5. As per claims 1 and 30, Vaidya teaches a method for detecting intrusion on a network, comprising:

storing signature profiles identifying patterns associated with network intrusion in a signature database [column 3, lines 27-38 and column 6, lines 35-42];

generating classification rules based on said signature profiles [column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 8];

receiving data packets transmitted on the network [column 6, lines 60-68];

classifying data packets having corresponding classification rules according to said generated classification rules [column 6, line 57 – column 7, line 10];

forwarding said classified packets to a signature engine for comparison with signature profiles [column 6, lines 63 – column 7, lines 5 and column 7, lines 11-21]. Vaidya further teaches classifying data packets according to classification rules [column 6, line 57- column 7, line 10]. Vaidya is silent on carrying out the classification by a first classification stage capable of classifying the data packets and a second classification stage capable of classifying the data packets received from the first classification stage. However, classification of data packets with multi-level stages is well known in the art, which has the advantage of enhancing the performance and efficiency of the system. For example, Li teaches carrying out classification by a first classification stage capable of classifying the data packets on a first set of packet characteristics and a second classification stage capable of classifying the data packets received from the first classification stage based on a second set of characteristics [column 3, line 63-column 4, line 7, column 6, lines 37-67 and figure 7A]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to employ the teachings of Li within the system of Vaidya in order to enhance the performance and efficiency of the system.

6. As per claims 3-9, Vaidya further teaches classifying said packets according to at least one packet field into groups [column 9, lines 46-61 and column 7, lines 2-21].

7. As per claims 10, 11, 13 and 14, Vaidya further teaches performing a table lookup to select an action to be performed on said packet based on its classification [column 7, lines 2-11 and column 9, lines 27-35].
8. As per claims 15 and 16, Vaidya further teaches partitioning signatures into disjoint groups to define subsets of signature profiles [column 6, lines 27-42].
9. As per claims 17-19, Vaidya further teaches filtering received packets and capturing packets at a network analysis device [column 8, lines 40-55].
10. As per claim 31, Li further teaches the method wherein the first set of packet characteristics includes at least one of a destination address, a protocol type and a destination port number [column 9, lines 37-60 and figures 6 & 7A].
11. As per claim 32, Li further teaches the method wherein the second set of packet characteristics includes at least one of packet type and a size [column 6, lines 37-67].
12. As per claims 33 and 34, Li further teaches the method wherein only the second classification stage remains in communication with a flow table for identifying an action to be taken with respect to the data packets [column 6, lines 37-67 and figures 7 and & A].
13. As per claim 35, Vaidya further teaches the method wherein the classification rules are generated after filtering the data packets [column 3, line 65 – column 4, line 8].

14. Claims 20-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Copeland, III US Pub. 2002/0144156 A1 (hereinafter Copeland) in view of Li US Patent 6,567,408 B1.

15. As per claim 20, Copeland teaches an intrusion detection system comprising:
a signature classifier comprising a classifier operable to classify packets according to at least one packet field into groups [paragraph 0139, 0140 and 0165];
a flow table configured to support table lookups of actions associated with classified packets [paragraphs 0148, 0149];
a signature database for storing signature profiles identifying patterns associated with network intrusion [paragraphs 0020, 0153-0155]; and
a detection engine operable to perform a table lookup at the flow table select an action to be performed on said packet based on its classification, wherein comparing said packets to at least a subset of the signature profiles is one of the actions [paragraphs 0157 –0159 and 0163-0165]. Furthermore, Copeland teaches classifying data packets according to data packet information [paragraph 0139, 0140 and 0165]. Copeland is silent on a classifier comprising a first stage classifier operable to classify packets according to at least one packet field into groups and a second stage classifier operable to classify said packets within each of the groups according to packet type or size. However, classification of data packets with multi-level stages is well known in the art, which has the advantage of enhancing the performance and efficiency of the system. For example, Li teaches classifier comprising a first stage classifier operable to classify packets according to at least one packet field into groups and a second stage classifier operable to classify said packets within each of the groups according to packet type or size [column 3, line 63-column 4, line 7, column 6, lines 37-67 and figure 7A]. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to employ the teachings of Li within the system of Copeland in order to enhance the performance and efficiency of the system.

16. As per claims 21 and 22, Copeland teaches the system further comprising a data monitoring device having a capture engine operable to capture data passing through the network and configured to monitor network traffic, decode protocols, and analyze received data [paragraph 0137].
17. As per claim 23, Copeland further teaches a parser operable to parse, generate and load signatures at the detection engine [paragraphs 0142-0146].
18. As per claims 24, Copeland further teaches the system comprising an alarm manager operable to generate alarms [paragraphs 0162-0164].
19. As per claims 25 and 26, Copeland further teaches a filter configured to filter out packets received at the intrusion detection system [paragraphs 0139-0141].
20. As per claim 27, Copeland further teaches the flow table is a hash table [paragraphs 0149-0150]
21. As per claims 28 and 29, Copeland further teaches action options listed in the flow table include dropping the packet and generating an alarm [paragraph 0165].

Art Unit: 2135

22. Claims 2 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vaidya US Patent 6,279,113 in view of Li et al. US Patent 6,567,408 B1 and further in view of Copeland US Pub. 2002/0144156 A1.

23. As per claims 2 and 12, Vaidya-Li teach the method as applied to claim 1 above. Vaidya-Li is silent on the method comprising dropping data packets without corresponding classification rules. However, Copeland teaches an intrusion detection system including dropping data packets without corresponding classification rules [paragraph 0165]. Both Vaidya-Li and Copeland teach a network intrusion detection system. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to employ the teachings of Copeland within the system of Vaidya-LI in order to enhance the security of the system.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beemnet W. Dada whose telephone number is (571) 272-3847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (9:00 am - 5:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Beemnet Dada

February 18, 2006



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100